

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed January 21, 2009, submitted concurrently with a two month extension of time to extend the due date for response to June 22, 2009.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6-15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to their underlying subject matter. Thus, allowed claims 16 and 17 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over the claims of copending U.S. Patent Application Nos. 10/588,437, 10/588,779, and 10/588,758. Applicant has previously submitted with the response filed April 21, 2009 Power of Attorneys executed by the individual assignees, namely Panasonic Electric Works, Ltd. And Proctor & Gamble Company, to validate the terminal disclaimers previously filed on October 23, 2008 for U.S. Patent Application Nos. 10/588,437, 10/588,779, and 10/588,758. The Examiner has indicated in the Advisory Action dated April 29, 2009 that these rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten as independent claims including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and in such a manner as to overcome the double patenting rejections. This objection has been overcome by the amendments to claim 16 presented in the response filed April 21, 2009. In the Advisory Action dated April 29, 2009, the Examiner has deemed claims 16 and 17 to be allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5-9 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Coffee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,208), and further in view of Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,228). Further, claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Coffee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,208) and further in view of Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,228) and Kelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,380,786). Still further, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeffries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,050) in view of Coffee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,595,208), and further in view of Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,228), and Urano et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0002995). These rejections have been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: June 22, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC

1100 17th Street, N.W.

Suite 503

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 530-1280

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.